LES

Comparing the Effect of Collaborative versus Individual Test Practice on Enhancing Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Knowledge of Parts of Speech

[1]Mohammad Reza Khodareza, [2]Gholamhossein Shabani

[1]Department of English, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran
[2]Department of English, Roudsar and Amlash Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudsar, Iran

(Corresponding author)
Gh.Shabani762@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study was an attempt to investigate the effectiveness of two types of classroom test practice procedures (individual versus collaborative conditions) on enhancing Iranian intermediate EFL learners' knowledge of parts of speech. To do so, a quasi-experimental study was carried out, in which sixty Iranian intermediate EFL learners majoring in TEFL were selected as the target participants to serve the purpose and requirements of the study. Their age range was from 19 to 28. To keep the homogeneity of the participants, a proficiency test titled Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) was given to 92 sophomore students majoring in TEFL, through which sixty were selected based on their scores. The participants were then randomly assigned into two equal comparison groups: The Collaborative Test Practice (CTP = 30) group and the Individual Test Practice (ITP = 30) group. Both the CTP and ITP groups were administered a pretest on vocabulary parts of speech. The two groups then received a ten-session treatment. The participants in the CTP group were involved in collaborative test practice on vocabulary parts of speech while the participants in the other comparison group were exposed to individual test practice condition with the parts of speech. Following the treatment provision, the two comparison groups were administered a posttest which was similar to the pretest except for the rearrangement of some items. The results of paired-samples t-test and independent-samples t-test revealed that both the CTP and ITP groups had vocabulary parts of speech gain but the effectiveness of collaborative test practice techniques on enhancing the participants' parts of speech in vocabulary was more significant than that of the individual test practice procedures.

Keywords: CELT, collaborative test practice, EFL intermediate learners, individual test practice, parts of speech

1. Introduction

Parts of speech in second language (L2) vocabulary are amongst the most stimulating and intriguing aspects of vocabulary learning which have attracted a surge of interest from educators, researchers, teachers, and learners. "Collocations are linguistic phenomena that occur when two or more words appear together more often than by chance and whose meaning often cannot be inferred from the meanings of its parts" (Petrovic, Snajder, & Basic, 2009, P. 388).

Individual and collaborative approaches are two models of learning and teaching tendencies, either of which possesses its own merits. Banerjee (2000) favored the collaborative learning process, arguing that learners are provided some sort of cooperative opportunities in which they formulate ideas about the material assigned to them, test their formulated assumptions, clarify them, come to a conclusion, and then assimilate that material. Within collaborative learning environment, learners feel that they should loop together what they own and share the material and knowledge to their other peers so that the work under consideration can be jointly or collaboratively completed. According to Banerjee (2000), each single student is a dynamic contributor to both the learning and the teaching process. Foote (2009) demonstrated collaborative learning as a result of a social interaction integrating a community of learners and teachers, by which the members acquire and share experience or knowledge. Collaborative learning promotes active learning and student-reliance in classrooms, learners move away from passive receptors of knowledge into active creators.   Students tend to take the responsibility for their learning through joint work and collective participation, think critically about related issues when they work as a team. Smith and MacGregor (2009) argued for the importance of collaboration process by noting it as being useful in that he associated the enhancement of students' social skills like decision-making, conflict management, and communication with what collaboratively occurs in learning contexts. Through the shared learning, a wide variety of responses arise and create a product that is indicative of a wide range of perspectives. Likewise, Oxnevad (2013) noted that through knowledge sharing and comments offered, learners are supplied with opportunities to receive immediate feedback. While working together, students generate novel viewpoints by connecting their prior knowledge, the course content, and personal experiences.

The result of studies by Ertmer and Stepich (2004) and Ciftci and Kocoglu (2012) has shown that the use of constructive feedback can enhance the quality of student discussion responses. The use of peer feedback in particular learning environments produces some advantages such as increasing the timeliness of feedback, offering new learning opportunities for both givers and receivers of feedback, humanizing the environment, and building community through online interaction (Corgan, Hammer, Margolies, & Crossley, 2004). Some studies have indicated the effects of collaboration on learning collocations by claiming that collaborative environment for teaching and learning is found to be more interesting and useful than the traditional view to teaching and learning (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2007). They held that the traditional view to teaching in which the teacher is a lecturer and the student is a passive listener appears to be inadequate. Collaborative learning also enhances interaction among students. It also gives students the opportunity of self and other-evaluation before teacher-evaluation. Ghaith (2001) pointed out that learners in cooperative learning settings feel responsible for their own learning and get equal opportunities to demonstrate their learning. Words parts of speech and collocations play essential role in the successful and native-like performance of second language learners. Shin (2007) and Nesselhauf (2003) pointed out that words parts of speech and collocations are as two big and pervasive components in English, both of which are crucial and problematic for language learners. Learners' gain of parts of speech and collocations are indicative of their native-like selection and can ensure their speaking and writing as being native-like by using appropriate and accurate forms of words. Despite their importance, collocations are a problematic area of second language learning. Koosha and Jafarpoor (2006) showed that the majority of Iranian EFL learners are good at the use of grammar and vocabulary but have major problems with the production of English parts of speech in vocabulary and collocations.

The focus of this study was on the applications of two patterns of test practice (individual versus collective modes), widely applied as in-class assignments, to examine how and to what extent they each enhance Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary gain, in particular, their impact on parts of speech in vocabulary. Therefore, it aimed at examining

undergraduate students' vocabulary abilities as a result of using collaborative and individual test practices in a fundamental English course. In order to reach this aim, the following research hypotheses were presented:

H01: Collaborative test practice does not have any impact on enhancing Iranian intermediate EFL learners' parts of speech.

H02: Individual test practice does not have any impact on enhancing Iranian intermediate EFL learners' parts of speech.

H03: There is no significant difference between the effects of individual test practice and collaborative test practice presentation on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' parts of speech.

2. Review of the Related Literature

2.1 Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Learning strategies are learners' mental activities that facilitate learning, systematize and remember knowledge. According to Parks (1995) and Fulk and King (2001), one of these strategies is collaborative learning that has been referred to in L2 education for many years, the purpose of which has been to improve academic, social and responsibility skills and motivate learners to communicate with other individuals and groups within the classroom settings. Johnson and Johnson (1987) argued for collaboration in L2 vocabulary learning in that it improves cognitive growth since learners benefit from the strength of thinking of others in a group. Likewise, collaborative learning helps learners use others' information in a group and also develop knowledge, skills and attitudes that will be beneficial to students and leads to their successes. Nation (2008) referred to learning strategy as one of the important factors in vocabulary learning and stated that learners become independent and strong in vocabulary through strategy learning.

Oxford (1990) provided a classification of vocabulary strategies involving two groups: (1) those for the finding of a new word's meaning and (2) those for consolidating a word once it has been encountered. According to this taxonomy, discovery strategies involve several determination strategies and social strategies. In this regard, a learner may find a new word's meaning through guessing from context, guessing from an L1 cognate, using reference materials, or asking someone else. Based on another classification by Oxford (1990), vocabulary learning comprises four strategy groups including social, memory, cognitive and meta-cognitive.

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) classified these strategies into three categories: meta-cognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social / affective strategies. The first one - meta-cognitive strategies - deals with planning, monitoring, or evaluating improvement. The second one - cognitive strategies - directly affect received data to make it easier for learning. The last one, i. e., embracing social/affective strategies, are concerned with the interaction and connection with others and controlling the affective aspects of language. Schmitt (1997) asserted that social strategies have learners to resort to communication with others to make their learning easy; memory strategies involves the application of those methods helping correlate new materials to previous knowledge; finally, meta-cognitive strategies involve adopting a conscious overlook of the learning process and making decisions about planning, monitoring, or evaluating the best way to study. Schmitt's (1997) classification of vocabulary learning strategies was investigated by subsequent studies by Cook and Mayer (1983) and Nation (1990).

Arguelles, Hughes, Klingner, and Vaughn (1999) introduced a different classification of vocabulary strategies being composed of four components nominated as: preview, click and clunk, get and gist, and wrapping up. The first strategy (Preview) deals with using previous or prior information and examining text structure before getting involved in reading text to which L2 learners are exposed; The Click and Clunk strategy requires learners to keep self-monitoring during reading. The third strategy that is known as Get the Gist has students write the main idea of any text during reading. The wrapping up strategy is applied when learners are supposed to generate questions and review text after an entire passage.

2.2 Dominant Vocabulary Instruction Models

The effectiveness of the vocabulary instruction, including the extent to which the L2 instructor are able to supply the learners with strategies on how to approach and deal with unknown vocabulary items, relies in part on the pedagogical approach and learning model or models chosen and implemented by the teacher. Rebecca-Huffan (2010) provided an overview of some common models used in L2 vocabulary instruction. She asserted that many of these models can be implemented simultaneously in the L2 learning classroom, and some can be   overlapped in terms of their points of concentration, classroom structures or learning techniques, but each makes a unique emphasis on how it approaches effective vocabulary instruction.

2.2.1 Depth of processing model.

This model assumed that TL vocabulary items should be expanded to include interaction with learners' sensory level processing. The *depth of processing model* is built on the keyword method's notions of supplying the learners with associated imagery of a word to incorporate acoustic connections and elucidation at the semantic level (Craik & Tulving, 1975; Pressley, Levin, & Delaney, as cited in Rebecca-Huffan, 2010). The followers of this model insist on that in expanding learners' sensory-based associations with vocabulary items, a strong cognitive processing occurs that by itself brings about establishing more intensified and long-term connections with the TL vocabulary items.

2.2.2 Deliberate teaching of vocabulary.

Nation (1998, 2008) maintains that this method of instruction is still an integral part of a well-balanced vocabulary program. He, furthermore, held that L2 vocabulary knowledge is best built up or constructed over a series of varied encounters with the word. At best condition, L2 vocabulary teaching can provide only one or two of these meetings, so other encounters must be involved, in particular, learners' deliberate study of a word, their becoming acquainted with the word through meaning-centered input and output, and fluency development activities.

Nation (2007) asserts that second language learners are only able to learn a small or limited portion of vocabulary item components including its meaning, its forms are and where and how it is used in context in any single context or lesson. Therefore, Nation (2008) emphasized enhancing L2 learners' lexical awareness, embarking on encouraging positive attitudes and motivation in vocabulary learning which requires framing and promoting learners' perceptions of the vocabulary acquisition process. He viewed learning any particular word as a cumulative process in which knowledge is built up over a series of varied meetings with the word. Once learners understand the scope of the vocabulary learning process, they come to grasp the complexity of vocabulary acquisition and attain satisfaction when their recall is perfect. He noted that this process does not occur instantaneously, but rather through a number of assorted encounters.

2.2.3 Vocabulary learning through context.

This model of L2 vocabulary instruction is in line with fostering lexical awareness through explicit instruction of multiple levels of vocabulary knowledge stressed by Nation (2007) because he concentrated on a view of learning that mostly stresses context. He believed that a true acquisition takes place when L2 learners are exposed to the context bearing message-focused activities involving listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and where the instruction involves items that learners find totally relevant to that certain activity. The integral aspect of this model is its concentration on the environment (context) of the vocabulary activity wherein teachers consider to integrate various modes of input/output that contain the target vocabulary items.

In addition, Sternberg (1987) recognized the significance of the environment of the vocabulary learning, stating that most vocabulary is learned from context. Training learners to read and interpret the temporal, spatial, value, stative descriptive, functional descriptive, causal/enablement, class membership and equivalence cues offered through the context of a word equips learners with the skills to deduce meaning, form and even use from context.

2.2.4 Multimedia and computer-assisted language learning approaches.

With the advent and ever-increasing popularity of multimedia and computer facilities, L2 instructors considered integrating these accessible technological tools into their classroom. Language learning research suggests that the integrating students into multimedia and/or computer-based environment supplies them interaction with media and involves them in computer-assisted tasks, which promote heightened engagement with the TL material and establish more meaningful and lasting connections with the content. In addition, integration into computer-based environment triggers students' ability to act with words and generates social realities in and out of the classroom, and thus to facilitate learning (Debski, Jeon-Ellis, & Wigglesworth, 2005).

Goldstein and Laufer (2004) reported the importance of vocabulary learning through the involvement of computer and media-based environments, stating outright that interaction with computers and media allow learners to go beyond previously-achieved perspectives of vocabulary knowledge – transition from a state of passive recognition to active recall of vocabulary - and indulge into the interconnected subfeatures of a word (knowledge of production forms, morphological, grammatical, semantic, associational, etc.), examine, and explore the target vocabulary at multiple levels.

2.2.5 Individual learning model.

The individual learning model is associated with traditional second language instruction. This model of L2 vocabulary learning, also referred to as *self-directed* or *autonomous* learning, is one of the most widely implemented models in second language vocabulary instruction. It originated from the well-known studies by Piaget (1965) and Chomsky (1965) who have primarily focused on the role of individual cognition in the learning process. Through the fundamentals of this model, students are assigned works as learning activities by which they are required to complete individually by embarking on their individual cognitive resources and capabilities. The advocates of this model, according to Rebecca-Huffan (2010), do not believe in interaction among individual L2 members in a classroom, claiming that interaction with other peers in the classroom triggers an asymmetrical power dynamic and unbalanced social status among members of collaborative learning groups, especially common among adults, the idea offered by Piaget (1965). Rather, the proponents of individual second language learning approach maintain that "working alone enhances independence and, with this autonomy comes an increase in communicative skills: the ability to use the language in unplanned situations, flexibility in accessing a range of sources to obtain linguistic and factual information, setting individual goals regarding topics of personal interest to study (Rebecca-Huffan, 2010).

2.2.6 The collaborative learning model.

This model of L2 instruction is primarily related to collaborative strategy, in which learners can solve problems although the problems may be above their proficiency levels. In addition, assigning collaborative small- group or pair-work activities helps learners master concepts and components of the course and better understand content of instructional texts. In this view, students are encouraged to acquire and apply some strategies to complete tasks for understanding text content cooperatively (Rebecca-Huffan, 2010; Savignon, 2001). Collaborative learning helps learners not only receive success but also make better academic, social and responsibility skills in students (Van-Zant & Bailys, 2002). Their professional research also indicated that collaboration is an effective way for learners to work collectively with a struggling sense, by receiving help, clarifying and reorganizing others' understanding.

The collaborative learning model is considered a way for constructing shared understandings, in which "students collaboratively construct and produce knowledge through social interaction and, communication is a classroom approach supported by teachers and researchers across a variety of disciplines in their work with learners of varied backgrounds, ages and cultures, and communication skills" (Bruffee, 1984, p. 640). It is also known as cooperative learning, social learning or group learning. It is best recognized for its contributions to the L2 learners' social and individual development on the sense that students are supplied chances by assigning activities to engage collectively in constructing interpersonal skills, problem-solving, constructing shared understandings, and also enhance their relationship to the community at large (Rebecca-Huffan, 2010).

This model is of particular relevance and grew out of Vygotsky's (1978) best-known social constructivism theory, which has been influential in second language learning, child development and cultural-historical psychology through his emphasis on the social aspect of individual learning and thinking processes, later elaborated as *cultural mediation* and *internalization*. Vygotsky asserted that thinking is a social activity that is shared between two or more people, and that thinking eventually becomes an internalized action that reemerges as an individual accomplishment.

2.3 Previous Research Studies and Findings

Rafie, Jahandar, and Khodabandehlou (2013) did a study to shed light on the effect of individual versus collaborative study of the vocabulary items through a task-based activity on learner's beliefs about English language vocabulary learning; in other words, their research design aimed at exploring the role of collaboration in influencing Iranian EFL learners' beliefs about EFL vocabulary instruction. This study comprised an experimental study of two groups of learners who engaged in the completion of a task with a partner or alone. The findings of the study revealed that collaborative learning had significant effect on EFL learners' belief about learning vocabulary. It was also reported that collaborative learning had significant effect on EFL learners' vocabulary learning.

Sadeghi and Safari (2012) conducted a study to investigate how and to what extent two models of L2 vocabulary instruction (collaborative learning task versus direct method) can improve the EFL vocabulary acquisition. The result of the study indicated that collaborative learning task played a significant role in improving learner's vocabulary knowledge, and there was significant difference between the collaborative learning task and direct learning method.

Jahangiri and Alipour's (2014) study was to examine the comparative effects of collaborative and individual exercise type on Iranian intermediate EFL vocabulary learning. To this end, twenty-seven Iranian EFL learners of English were provided meaning and illustrative examples of the new target words through mini-dictionaries. These input data were practiced to them both individually and collaboratively through two types of exercise, including writing original sentence and fill-in-the-blank norm. The result of the study showed more significant role of collaboration in L2 vocabulary learning, and that the effect of collaboration depended on the exercise type.

Zarei and Sahami-Gilani (2013) investigated the effects of selected collaborative techniques (Jigsaw, Rotating Circles, Snowball, Think-Pair-Square, and Word Webbing) on adult EFL learners' vocabulary comprehension and production. The findings of their study indicated that collaboration was influential in EFL learners' L2 vocabulary learning in production and comprehension, and that word webbing, as one of the selected collaborative techniques, was the most effective technique on both vocabulary comprehension and production.

Kim (2008) studied the degree of effectiveness of collaborative versus individual tasks comparatively on EFL learners' vocabulary gain, following which he reported that the learners who were exposed to collaborative tasks outperformed the learners who practiced individual tasks in that vocabulary gain by the collaborative learners in the learning environment was significant.

Luan and Sappathy (2011) investigated the impact of collaborative and traditional (individual) modes of vocabulary instruction negotiated on L2 vocabulary acquisition. To conduct this experiment, one group was instructed though a two-way interactive task (information-gap), and the other group using traditional methods or a one-way input task. The comparative result of the study revealed that learners engaged in two-way interaction task had higher gain in vocabulary. In addition, Hwang (2002) did an experiment to find out the effectiveness of collaboration (negotiated interaction) as opposed to individual manner on EFL learners' L2 vocabulary gain, through which he found that the negotiated interaction group outperformed the non-negotiated interaction group in L2 vocabulary gain.

Fernandez-Dobao (2014) scrutinized the impact of collaborative mode of interaction on L2 vocabulary learning by assigning two sorts of interaction groups (paired interaction versus small-group interaction. Though this experiment, she compared the performance of the two collaborative task groups on the occurrence of lexical items. Findings indicated that group-interaction individuals learned and produced a higher percentage of lexical items than the L2 learners who practiced

lexical knowledge through pair interaction. In other words, peers' collaborative problem-solving activities resulted in more instances of L2 vocabulary learning than pair interaction.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants in this study were 60 intermediate EFL university students, majoring in TEFL at the Islamic Azad University of Tonekabon, Iran. They included both male and female, out of whom twenty-eight were male and thirty-two were female with an age range of 19 to 28 years old. All the participants' first language was Persian. In order to obtain a homogenized group, the participants were administered the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). The CELT test was given to ninety-two students out of whom sixty were selected based on the results of the test. Those students whose scores were one standard deviation above and below the mean (i.e., mean ±1) were selected as participants of this study. Then, they were randomly assigned into two equal comparison groups, including individual test practice group (ITPG=30) and collaborative test practice group (CTPG = 30).

3.2 Materials and Instruments

The materials and instruments used in this study were of four types as follows:

3.2.1 The Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT).

In order to keep the homogeneity of the participants under study, a multiple-choice-item CELT was administered to ninety-two students. According to the CELT results, the participants whose score range was one standard deviate above and below the mean (i.e., mean 1) were a signed for the sake of this study to serve the purpose of the research work.

3.2.2 Vocabulary pretest and posttest.

The test that was administered to the participants of both groups comprised twenty multiple-choice items (recognition type). All items in this test were concerned with parts of speech of words whose purpose was to examine the participants' ability to recognize and choose correct part of speech for any word given in multiple-choice-item form. The vocabulary test items were determined and constructed in accordance with the vocabulary book titled Vocabulary Focus Part One (Toloo, 2012). It was a book on morphology that the students in the university had already passed during their course of study. The same version of vocabulary multiple-choice-item test, with the rearrangement of some items, was administered as posttest to the both groups.

3.2.3 Pilot study.

The test constructed as the pretest and posttest of this study underwent a pilot study. To this end, a 40-multiple-choice-item vocabulary test which was constructed from Vocabulary Focus Part One (Toloo, 2012) was given to 40 subjects having similar characteristics as those of the target groups. Given the psychometric characteristics of the items (item facility, item discrimination, and choice distribution), the poor items were discarded from the final version, and a 20-multiple-choice-item vocabulary test was established to be administered for the pre-test and post-test in this study.

3.2.4 The material for the treatment.

The material employed as the treatment for the two comparison groups comprised ten samples of vocabulary exercises, each of which was composed of ten head words along with the related parts of speech for each. Each word and its related parts of speech were followed by fill-in-the-blank exercises, out of which the participants were supposed to read and complete through the relevant part of speech. The part-of-speech models of exercises did not need culture-specific or discipline-specific background knowledge. They were extracted from vocabulary teaching materials designed for intermediate EFL learners. The words and relevant exercises were selected from Vocabulary Focus Part one (Toloo, 2012).

3.3 Procedure

In order to keep the homogeneity of the participants in this study, the multiple-choice CELT test was administered to ninety-two EFL students, out of whom 60 were selected as the target group participants. After the administration of the CELT test, a pretest including twenty vocabulary on parts of speech was given to the participants, after which they were assigned into two equal groups (ITPG = 30, and CTPC = 30). The participants of the two assigned groups were offered their treatments for the same period of time through the same material and based on the same methodology. To serve the purpose of this study, the treatment material selected, comprised ten samples of vocabulary exercises, each of which included ten head words with its relevant parts of speech, followed by fill-in-the-blank exercises. In general, the ten samples of vocabulary exercises were taught during ten sessions of treatment (treatment for the experimental group and placebo for the control group). During each session, one sample of exercise, including ten vocabulary items along with its relevant parts of speech and related exercises, was taught to the participants of each group. The time allotted for the two groups was equally assigned, including seventy-five minutes for each group in each session. Both the experimental (CTP) group and the control (ITP) group were taught by the same teacher. The participants of the two groups were supposed to work on the material based on the instructions given to them.

The participants in the CTP (experimental) group were asked to practice and learn the new words and their relevant parts of speech, and work on the related fill-in-the-blank tests through collaborative tasks which encouraged pair and small-group interaction among the individuals. The collaborative tasks which were employed for this group as inner-class activity were Jigsaw, Rotating Circles, and Think-Pair-Square, which had the participants to work collectively and actively participate to complete the task. These activities had them each hold part of the information and share knowledge needed to complete the task. The meaning of the new words were clarified and enhanced through the techniques of definition, synonym, antonym, and exemplification, supplemented merely through the medium of monolingual dictionary wherever necessary.

The participants of the ITP (control) group were offered and instructed the same material, within the same length of time, and by the same teacher as for the CTP group but through a different instructional way. To meet the requirements of this group, they were supposed to deal with and learn the new words and related parts of speech, and practice the tests via one-way or individual task. Based on the requirement of this group, the participants in this group were supposed to work on the words and related exercise individually without collaboration and interaction with other peers. Through this individual manner of test practice, the burden of completing the task successfully was placed on the individual participant who held the information. To do so, the participants were required to work on ten words along with their parts of speech for each session and do the related word exercises given in fill-in-blank forms. They were given chance to fill in the blanks, as the required test practice, with the vocabulary parts of speech given. The participants were allowed to make use of just monolingual dictionaries to look up the words and deal with their meanings. Like the CTP group, they were encouraged to clarify the unknown words by providing antonym or synonym. After the fulfillment of treatment for the both groups within ten sessions, they were given the posttest, which was the same version of test on vocabulary administered as pretest, with a rearrangement of some items in the posttest. In other words, the post-test was equal to the pretest in all respects except for the rearrangement of some items to avoid testing effect.

3.4 Design

All requirements of a quasi-experimental study, including pretest, posttest, randomization, treatment for the experimental group and placebo for the control group were met in this study. The independent variables of the study were collaborative test practice and individual test practice, and the dependent variable was words parts of speech.

3.5 Data Analysis

The collected data were entered into the SPSS 16.0 for further analysis. Two paired- samples t-tests and an independent-samples t-test were used to test the null hypotheses of the study and the alpha level for significance testing was set at .05.

4. Result

The description of the statistical analyses pertaining to the test and the null hypotheses of this research were represented as follows:

4.1 Testing the First Null Hypothesis

The first null hypothesis of this study was: collaborative test practice does not have any impact on Iranian intermediate EFL Learners' parts of speech. To examine this hypothesis, a paired-samples t-test was conducted. The descriptive statistics are represented in Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of the Paired-Samples T-Test for the Experimental Group (CTP Group)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-EX	12.20	30	3.98	.72
	Post-EX	15.45	30	2.45	.45

Table 1 shows that the posttest mean score (15.345) of the CTP group was more than the pretest mean score (12.20). The standard deviation for the posttest was less than the pretest. This image may indicate less variability among CTP group's posttest scores compared to the pretest scores.

In order to find out whether there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the CTP group, the results of paired-samples t-test are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Paired Differences (CTP Group)

		Paired Differences					
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	PreEX - postEX	3.45	1.73	.32	10.40	29	.000

According to Table 2, there is a significant difference, t (29) = 10.40, p= .000), between the pretest-posttest mean scores of the CTP group. Therefore, the first null hypothesis of the study was rejected.

4.2 Testing the Second Null Hypothesis

The second hypothesis of the study stated: "Individual test practice does not have any impact on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' words parts of speech". To investigate this hypothesis, a paired-samples t-test was run for the ITP group.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Paired-Samples t-test for the Comparison Group (ITP Group)

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-CON	12.07	30	3.94	.72
	Post-CON	13.26	30	2.78	.52

As the Table 3 shows, the mean score of ITP Group in pretest was 12.07 but in the posttest was 13.26. So the participants experienced vocabulary gain after treatment. This image indicated the rejection of the second null hypothesis. Furthermore, standard deviation (Std. Deviation) for the posttest in this group was less than that of the pretest. This may be indicative of less variability among ITP group's posttest scores than that of the pretest. Likewise, the Table 4 provides further information concerning the rejection of the second null hypothesis.

Table 4

Paired–Samples T-Test for the ITP Group

	Paired Differences					
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 Pre-CON – Post-CON	1.19	1.65	.29	3.96	29	.000

According to Table 4, there is a significant difference, t (29) = 3.96, p= .00), between the pretest-posttest mean scores of the ITP Group. Therefore, the second null hypothesis of the study, which stated that individual test practice does not have any impact on enhancing Iranian intermediate EFL learners' words parts of speech, is rejected. Accordingly, the second hypothesis was rejected.

4.3 Testing the Third Null Hypothesis

The third null hypothesis assumed for this study indicated: "There is no significant differences between the effects of individual test practice and collaborative test practice presentation on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' parts of speech of words". To examine this hypothesis, an independent-samples t-test was run. The descriptive statistics of the results are represented in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for the CTP and ITP Groups in the Posttest

	Input enhancement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocabulary	Collaborative Test Practice	30	15.45	2.45	.45
	Individual Test Practice	30	13.26	2.78	.52

According to Table 5, the mean of the CTP Group in the posttest was 15.45, and that of the ITP Group was 13.26. The results indicated that the CTP Group outperformed the ITP Group. Therefore, it was to say that employing collaborative tasks for test practice were more effective than individual tasks for test practice in that they brought about more significant gain in words parts of speech. In addition, the standard deviation value for the CTP group, according to the table, is less than the other group, indicating that there was less variability in the scores of the CTP participants compared with those of the ITP group's participants. However, to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups' mean scores in the posttest, the results of the independent-samples t-test are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Independent-Samples T-Test for the CTP and ITP Groups in the Posttest

		t-test for Equality of Means				
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Lower	Upper
Vocabulary	Equal variances assumed	3.13	58	.003	.75	3.53
	Equal variances not assumed	3.13	57.16	.003	.75	3.53

Table 6 demonstrates that there is a significant difference, t (58) = 3.13, p= .003, between the CTP and ITP groups. Therefore, the third null hypothesis of the study was rejected.

4.4 Discussion

This study aimed at examining the effect of collaborative versus individual test practice as two techniques for enhancing vocabulary in EFL contexts on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' knowledge of parts of speech. The results obtained from this study indicated that the collaborative test practice and individual test practice were both effective on EFL Learners' vocabulary learning, but employing collaborative tasks such as Jig-saw, Rotating Circles, and Think-Pair-Square had a significant effect on enhancing Iranian intermediate EFL learners' gain in vocabulary compared to that of individual tasks to test practice. The result of this study showed that the collaborative tasks, to which L2 learners are exposed, brought about more productive result considering their potential impact on facilitating EFL learners' vocabulary learning effort and providing chances for interpersonal interaction. Savignon (2001) asserted that as learners get involved in interactive environment through the medium of collaborative tasks, they work collectively with a struggling sense, by receiving help, clarifying and reorganizing others' understanding. In addition, through interactive activities, they construct shared understandings. Students collaboratively construct and produce knowledge through social interaction and interpersonal communication skills. Rebecca-Huffan (2010) advocated collaborative learning by arguing that it brings about cooperative learning, social learning or group learning in the sense that learners are given chances for interaction by assigning activities so that they can be engaged collectively in constructing interpersonal skills, problem-solving, constructing shared understandings, and also enhancing their relationship to the community with whom they work.

The findings of this study are consistent with Kim's (2008) result of research work through which he reported the significant effectiveness of collaborative over individual tasks on students' vocabulary gain in that the learners to whom vocabulary was instructed through collaborative tasks outperformed those who were exposed to individual tasks.

The findings of this study are also in line with what Luan and Sappathy (2011) reported through investigating the impact of two modes of vocabulary instruction (collaborative and individual) on L2 vocabulary acquisition. The result of his experiment outlined that the L2 students, who were instructed though a two-way interactive task (information-gap), experienced higher gain of L2 vocabulary compared with those who were exposed to the traditional methods (one-way input task). He find out that L2 learners gained L2 vocabulary more effectively as a result of collaboration (negotiated interaction) as opposed to individual manner.

The result of the present study is also in accordance with Sadeghi and Safari's (2012) research findings in the sense that they carried out a study on the impact of two models of L2 vocabulary instruction (collaborative learning task versus direct method) to find out how and to what extent they can improve EFL L2 vocabulary acquisition. They revealed that as L2 learners get engaged into collaborative learning tasks, they experience notable improvement in vocabulary knowledge, and that the impact of collaborative tasks outweighed learning through individual method. The findings of this research work are in accordance with the findings of Jahangiri and Alipour's (2014) and Zarei and Sahami-Gilani's (2013) study who indicated the positive effect of collaborative model of vocabulary and the merits of this mode of instruction over one-way tasks for vocabulary instruction.

5. Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed that collaborative test practice tasks were more effective than individual test practice tasks in Iranian EFL classes and vocabulary learning contexts. To have a successful language learning context, instructors need to pay attention to the various language learning processes including methodological approach, learning environment, and pedagogical tools since they all are related to vocabulary acquisition.

Learning lexical items and meaning-bearing items is much more important than other components of language. To this, there is much emphasis to the presentation and practice of the second language lexicon in an appropriate and logical manner (Shokouhi & Pishkar, 2015). Integration into collaborative test practice leads to EFL learners' better performance in learning L2 vocabulary parts of speech and attributes to the fact that collaborative practice provides contexts in which targeted vocabulary learning is more facilitated than when the targeted words are practiced individually.

The findings of the current study will be helpful to English teachers and language learners in EFL classes. Teachers and L2 learners need to be in pursuit of the approaches and procedures that may facilitate the acquisition of the appropriate load of vocabulary they need. Teachers can assist EFL learners to maximize and enrich their knowledge of lexical competence by exposing them to tasks whose potential is to encourage collaborative practice among EFL learners. Instructors need to deliberately supply tasks in which learners will be able to learn and review newly offered words in meaningful and effective settings collaboratively. EFL learners, as the consumers of language, can benefit from this method of language instruction in that it can optimize their efficiency and durability of vocabulary learning and improve their effectiveness of new information gains.

This study aimed at investigating the comparative impact of collaborative versus individual test practice on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' knowledge of parts of speech. The future studies can focus on pre-intermediate and advanced levels of proficiency. In addition, the future studies can examine the effectiveness of these two models (collaborative versus individual test practices) on other components of L2 vocabulary, for example, phrasal verbs and two-word

References

Arguelles, M. E., Hughes, M. T., Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1999). Sustaining research-based practices in reading a 3-year follow-up. *Remedial and Special Education, 20* (5), 263-287.

Altinay, L., & Paraskevas, A. (2007). A computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) approach in teaching research methods. *Science Journal, 26*, 623–644.

Banerjee, R. (2000). *The benefits of collaborative learning*. Retrieved from http://www.brighthub.com/education/k-12/articles/70619.aspx

Bruffee, K.A. (1999). Collaborative learning: higher education. *Interdependence and the Authority of Knowledge.* Balti more, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ciftci, H., & Kocoglu, Z. (2012). Effects of peer e-feedback on Turkish EFL students' writing performance. *Journal of Education Computing Research, 46* (1), 61-84.

Cook, L. K., & Mayer, R. E. (1983). Reading Strategies Training for Meaningful Learning from Prose. In M. Pressley & J. Levin, (Eds.), *Cognitive strategy research*: *Educational applications* (pp. 87-131). New York: Springer Verlag.

Corgan, R., Hammer, V., Margolies, M., & Crossley, C. (2004). Making your online course successful. *Business Education Forum, 58* (3), 51-53.

Craik, F., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depths of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experi mental Psychology: General, 104,* 268-294.

Debski, R., Jeon-Ellis, G., & Wigglesworth, G. (2005). Oral interaction in the project-oriented CALL Classroom. *Lan guage, Learning and Technology, 9* (3), 121-145.

Ertmer, P., & Stepich, D. (2004). *Examining the relationship between higher-order learning and students' perceived sense of community in an online learning environment*. Paper presented at the 10th Australian World Wide Web conference, Gold Coast, Australia, December 12-15, 2004.

Fernández-Dobao, A. (2014). Vocabulary learning in collaborative tasks: A comparison of pair and small group work. *Language Teaching Research, 18* (4), 497–520.

Foote, E. (2009). *Collaborative learning in community college*. Retrieved from http://www.ericdigests.org /1998-1/ college es.htm.

Fulk, B. M., & King, K. (2001). Class wide peer tutoring at work. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 34* (2), 49-53.

Goldstein, Z., & Laufer, B. (2004). Testing vocabulary knowledge: Size, strength, and computer adaptiveness. *Language Learning, 54* (3). 399-436.

Hwang, K. (2002). L2 vocabulary development through conversation: A conversation Analysis. *Second Language Studies*, *23* (1), 27-66.

Jahangiri, K., & Abilipour, I. (2014). Effects of collaboration and exercise type on incidental vocabulary learning: Evidence against involvement load hypothesis. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98,* 704 – 712.

Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1987). Action research: Cooperative learning in the science classroom. *Science and Children, 24*, 31-32.

Kim, Y. (2008). The role of task-induced involvement and learner proficiency in L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning*, *58* (2), 285-325.

Koosha, M., & Jafarpour, A. (2006). Data-driven learning and teaching collocation of prepositions: The case of Iranian EFL adult learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*,192-209.

Ghaith, G. (2001). Learners' perceptions of their stand cooperative experience. *Elsevier Journal, 29*, 289-301.

Luan, N. L., & Sappathy, S. M. (2011). L2vocabulary acquisition: The Impact of negotiated interaction. *GEMA Online TM Journal of language studies*, *11* (2).1675-8021.

Mc Connell, D. (2002). The experience of collaborative assessment in e-learning. *Carfax Publishing*, 24, 73-92.

Nation, I.S.P., & Coady, J. (1988). Vocabulary and reading. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.). *Vocabulary and language teaching,* (pp. 97-110). London: Longman.

Nation, I. S. P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary.* New York: Newbury House.

Nation, I.S.P. (2007). Lexical awareness in second language learning. In N. Hornberger (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Boston: Springer.

Nation, I.S.P. (2008). *Teaching vocabulary: Strategies and techniques.* Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Nesselhauf, N. (2003).The use of collocations by advanced learners of English and some implications for teaching. *Applied linguistics, 24* (2), 223-242.

O'malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990*). Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxnevad, S. (2013). *6 powerful Google docs features to support the collaborative writing process*. Retrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume14/ej55/ej55m1.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies.* New York: Newbury House.

Park, S. (1995). Implications of learning strategy research for designing computer-assisted instruction. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 27*(4), 435- 456.

Piaget, J. (1965). *Les études sociologiques*. Genève: Droz.

Petrovic, S., Snajder, J., & Basic, B. D. (2009). Extending lexical association measures for collocation extraction. *Elsevier journal, 24*, 383–394.

Pressley, M., Levin, J. R., Hall, J.W., Miller, G.E., & Berry, J. K. (1980). The keyword method and foreign word acquisi tion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory, 6*, 163-173.

Rafie, F., Jahandar. Sh., & Khodabandehlou, M. (2013). The impact of collaborative learning on Iranian EFL learners' be liefs about vocabulary learning. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences, 3* (2), 15-163.

Rebecca-Huffan, S. (2010). *The influence of collaboration on attitudes towards English vocabulary learning* (Unpublished master's thesis). Iowa State University.

Sadeghi, B., & Safari, S. (2012). The impact of collaborative task on the FL vocabulary acquisition. *ABC Journal of Ad vanced Research*, *1* (2), 8-14.

Savignon, S. (2001). Communicative language teaching for the twenty-first century. In M. Cecile-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, Thomson Learning.

Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt & M. J. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, ac quisition and pedagogy* (pp. 199–227). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shin, D. (2007). What collocations would be unpredictable for Korean EFL learners? *Korean journal of applied linguistics, 23*, 83-98.

Shokouhi, A., & Pishkar, K. (2015). Collaborative method and vocabulary retention of teenage EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *5* (11), 2395-2401.

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. T. (2009). *What is collaborative learning?* Retrieved from http://learningcommons.evergreen.edu/pdf/collab.pdf.

Sternberg, R. J. (1987). Most vocabulary is learned from Context. In M. G. McKeown & M. E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 89-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Toloo, A. (2012). *Vocabulary focus (Part one): Based on bridging the gap.* Tehran: Jungle Publications.

Van - Zant, S., & Bailey, E. (2002). Unlocking peer potential for tutoring. *Education Digest, 67*(5), 44-45.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole (Ed.)*, Mind in society.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Zarei, A. A., & Sahami-Gilani, M. (2013). L2 vocabulary learning through collaborative techniques. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, *4* (1), 71-84.

Authors' Biography

Mohammad Reza Khodareza is an assistant professor in TEFL. He is currently a faculty member at the Islamic Azad University of Tonekabon, Iran, where he teaches TEFL courses. His areas of interest in research include writing assessment, reading-writing connection, and ELT issues.

Gholamhossein Shabani is a Ph. D. candidate in TEFL at the Islamic Azad University of Tonekabon, Iran. He is a faculty member at the Islamic Azad University of Roudsar and Amlash, Iran. He teaches in English institutes, too. His areas of interest in research are reading, vocabulary, and ELT issues.